Mr. Speaker, I thank

the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, the Spratt resolution

would permit the use of military force,

but only to eliminate the real danger

we face, Iraq’s possession of nuclear or

chemical or biological weapons. The

President’s resolution would allow the

administration to use military force to

seek regime change in Iraq, a very dangerous

course of action.

It is one thing to say to Saddam Hussein,

we are going to disarm you of

your weapons of mass destruction. It is

another thing to say, we are going to

kill you, which is what regime change

means. Faced with that threat, with

that assurance, there would be nothing

to deter Saddam Hussein from deciding,

like Sampson in the Philistine

temple, that he might as well pull

down the world around him. Why

should he not go down in history as an

Arab hero by attacking Israel with

chemical or biological weapons? Israel

may then feel well to retaliate, and no

one can calculate the course of escalation

from there.

Just the other day the Director of

the CIA, George Tenet, warned the

Senate that

The Spratt substitute is the most effective

way to go about disarming Saddam

Hussein, while avoiding tactics

that could very well end up in regional

conflagration. It grants more limited,

but still sufficient, power to the administration

to meet the threat posed by

Iraq’s weapons program. It allows for

the President to use force in conjunction

with the U.N. if it becomes necessary.

It does not, however, grant the President

a blank check, on the model of the

Gulf of Tonkin resolution, as the main

resolution before us does.

I am proud to support this resolution.

It maximizes the chances we will disarm

Saddam Hussein and eliminate the

real danger, without getting into a

major conflagration.